

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0. F	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/797,705 03/09/2004		03/09/2004	Keun-sik Kim	AM101338 4219			
25291	7590	08/16/2006		EXAMINER			
WYETH	WYETH				DAVIS, BRIAN J		
	LAW GROU			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
÷ ÷	DA FARMS N, NJ 0794		1621				
	,			DATE MAILED: 08/16/2000	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/797,705	KIM ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit

			i				
	Brian J. Davis	1621					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>31 July 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on 31 July 2006. A brief i</li> </ol>	n compliance with 37 CFR 41 37 m	ust he filed within two	months of the				
date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl	any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3	7(e)), to avoid dismis	sal of the				
AMENDMENTS	6						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause				
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		i E below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	•	ducina or simplifyina	the issues for				
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	lile issues ioi				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	morradio il cadimina in a coparato,	annoly mod unionality	J. C. Carros				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	•						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5-8 and 10-14</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					
BRIAN DAVIS PRIMARY EXAMINER							
/ //							

Continuation of 13. Other: As was communicated to applicant in detail in the 7/28/06 interview, any limitation with respect to a range of ammonia addition will not distinguish over the prior art of record. Case law also supports such a conclusion: It is well established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing a criticality. In re Becket, 33 USPQ 33 (CCPA 1937); In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1971).